

semiconductors and computers, the current competitiveness and efficiency of even these industries have benefited by international trade and competition.

Indeed, it is because of this enhanced efficiency in competition that I supported fast-track authority in 1988, supported the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and most recently the GATT agreement.

I take the Senate floor today because I have reached my own conclusion that when asked to vote in this body, I will not support fast-track authority as currently requested by the President of the United States this year. I do so despite a long history of supporting similar authority and as one who believes strongly in free trade as enhancing American competitiveness and it being essential to America's quality of life, because I believe the United States has reached an important crossroads in our trade strategy.

Like many Americans, I am simply not convinced that the U.S. Government has a strategy to maximize benefits in current trade agreements. I do not fear the competition of foreign trade. I simply fear that our negotiators are not prepared to protect and defend our national interests with a coherent strategy.

I base my conclusion on four principal problems.

First, over 4 decades, by necessity, through the cold war and in times of threats to our national security, it became necessary for the United States on occasion to compromise in our trade strategy in order to engage in the protection of other important national interests.

By necessity, whether it was to secure Philippine military bases or the cooperation of Korean or Turkish or a host of other allies, the United States would set apart our trade objectives in order to secure national security concerns.

Even now while American intellectual property rights are being compromised in China, we are being told that this is necessary for the political engagement of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. President, my first objection to fast-track authority to the President is these agreements on trade must stand for economic purposes of their own weight. The American people and this Congress must be convinced the country is pursuing a coherent trade strategy without compromise for other purposes.

Second, it is critical that this Congress be convinced that our trade negotiators are using the leverage of those seeking access to our market to its maximum advantage. In negotiating NAFTA, the United States afforded Mexico the most important advantage that any nation economically could ever seek. That is, to gain access to the American market for their products. But we did so without using all of the leverage available to the United

States. So Mexico, a country that is a principal conduit for narcotics into the United States, a source of massive illegal immigration to the United States, a nation which does not allow access to American products or investment without reservation, was afforded the opportunities of NAFTA without, by necessity, conceding cooperation on all these fronts. So in my mind, Mr. President, the second reason for a reservation in proceeding with fast-track authority is that the United States is not using its principal leverage in negotiating with other nations.

Third, Mr. President, in my mind, is the legitimate concern about the pace of international economic integration. Mr. President, during this debate, both in this body and in the other, no one will be quoted more often than Adam Smith. Indeed, to my mind, there is no man who has been read less and quoted more often than Adam Smith in his "Wealth of Nations." For my third reason in objecting to fast-track authority, I return to his treatise of more than two centuries ago when he said, "... freedom of trade should be restored only by slow gradations, and with a good deal of reserve and circumspection. Were those high duties and prohibitions taken away all at once ... the disorder which this would occasion might no doubt be very considerable."

Mr. President, free trade is a national objective, but like other human virtues, it may never be fully realized. It is forever pursued, but it requires so many changes in culture and values and so many complications that it must remain a goal, understanding it may never be realized. Every Member of this institution recognizes that fast-track authority and opening the American market involves a host, indeed hundreds, of different industries that compromise many communities and their economic strength. It is understood and recognized that, like manufacturing, certain high-labor-intensive industries have no long-term future in the American economy.

As Adam Smith warned two centuries ago, that does not mean that with haste or even immediacy they must be subjected to their demise. There are industries in this country that employ thousands, if not millions, of people who live on the economic margins of our society who have no other economic choice. The 50- or 60-year-old textile worker who may have lived in this country for generations, or be new to our land, who may speak English or may not, who may be educated or may have the bare minimum of education, will not in a single generation or with the stroke of a pen be transformed from a textile worker to a computer technician.

American trade policy with a goal of free trade must be realistic and fair to all elements of this society and must take into account the very disorder of which Adam Smith warned only that we be accommodating.

Mr. President, finally, a fourth and final reason that I believe this Senate should withhold fast-track authority on this occasion. It is based on a series of judgments that this Congress reached a long time ago. It has become, I believe, standard in this country, almost without reservation, to believe that it is appropriate, from bans on child labor to a reasonable minimum wage, to the human rights organized labor unions, to just and fair environmental standards. But our country now, in the decision to engage itself in free and open global trade, needs to reach a judgment. How is it we keep these basic commitments without engaging in an extraordinary and even hypocritical contradiction? At this moment in time, the Nation wants both to maintain these high moral standards, some of which have transcended generations, but at the same time to take advantage of the inexpensive products, the economic opportunities of importations where workers have no right to organize, nonexistent or unenforced minimum wage and, in many cases, almost no protections against child labor, and a minimum of environmental standards.

The difference, Mr. President, is whether or not the United States will, in some cases, engage in exploitation, not whether or not the United States will engage in free trade. I believe, therefore, Mr. President, that on this occasion, with a commitment to free trade and an understanding of the need and necessity for the United States to engage in free, fair, and open competition, this Congress should not grant unrestricted authority to the President of the United States to engage in trade negotiations, without reserving for ourselves the right to ensure that there is a trade strategy that encompasses the goal of reaching trade balance, dealing with structural imbalances that, by necessity, are arising from countries that continue to protect their own markets. And we deal with these inherent contradictions of how we maintain both a standard of living for those in our country who cannot quickly adjust to the competition, the contradictions of maintaining environmental labor standards, while allowing access to our market to those who do not.

This will require a trade strategy by the Executive that, to my judgment, has not yet been defined and may not yet exist. I do hope, however, Mr. President, that this is understood for what it is—not a retreat, not protectionism, just forcing this country, at long last, to begin to define a real and lasting trade strategy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT
AGREEMENT—H.R. 2607

Mr. LOTT. After consultation with many, many Senators and especially the Democratic leader, I now ask that

the Senate turn to the D.C. appropriations bill, H.R. 2607, and Senator STEVENS be recognized to offer a substitute amendment and that there be 2 hours of debate to be equally divided in the following fashion: 30 minutes between Senators STEVENS and BYRD, 30 minutes between Senators FAIRCLOTH and BOXER, 30 minutes between Senators GREGG and HOLLINGS, 30 minutes between Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY.

I further ask that no other amendments or motions be in order, and following the conclusion or yielding back of the time, the amendment be agreed to and the bill be advanced to third reading and passage, and all occur without further action or debate.

I further ask that following the adoption, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees, all without further action or debate.

I ask unanimous consent that in the event that H.R. 2607 is sent to the President without a conference, the Committee on Appropriations, with the concurrence of the chairman and ranking member, be permitted to file in the RECORD within 2 days of final passage and to print as an official document of the Senate a report on the final version of H.R. 2607 as enacted by the Congress.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of H.R. 2607, the Senate proceed to S. 1502 regarding D.C. scholarships, the bill be read the third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without further action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I want to confirm, as most Senators certainly know, there will be no further rollcall votes tonight, and while the Senators have this 2 hours of time, we don't anticipate the full time will be used.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. I want to commend the distinguished chair and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. Oftentimes we work through these things, and credit isn't allocated as it should be. In this case, this would not have happened were it not for the extraordinary effort on both sides of the aisle, in particular by the chairman and the ranking member. But I thank all Senators for their cooperation and the extraordinary effort they have put forth to get us to this point.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator DASCHLE for making those comments. He is certainly right. Senator STEVENS is very persistent, as is Senator BYRD, his worthy ally in this effort.

This has been a difficult agreement to put together, but it is the right thing to do at this hour. That way, we will have this package in the House and they will have a vehicle with these three bills on which they can act, and that will lead into, hopefully, final passage tomorrow. I do commend them for their very fine work.

I yield the floor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, MEDICAL LIABILITY REFORM, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the House bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2607) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1621

(Purpose: Making omnibus consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for himself and Mr. BYRD, proposes an amendment numbered 1621.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Carl Truscott of my staff be granted floor privileges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after completion of the pending motion and amendment, and passage, the Senator from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, be granted 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, as the 105th Congress draws to a close, we are finally, at last, about to complete action on the District of Columbia appropriations bill. The amendment before the Senate incorporates the conference report to the Commerce, Justice, State spending bill and the Foreign Operations spending bill, together with an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

I would like to speak very briefly to the provisions of the District of Columbia portion of this omnibus package. First of all, the ranking member of the

District of Columbia subcommittee, BARBARA BOXER, and I have ironed out all of our differences and we now have the bill that should have the support of the House and the administration.

At the moment, the District of Columbia is being funded on a temporary basis through a continuing resolution. It is critical that we pass this amendment as soon as possible because the Congress has yet to pass a District of Columbia rescue package and the management reform plan, which we enacted in August. Passage of this bill will ensure that that work goes forward to restructure the city's finances and impose some much-needed management reforms on the city and its various agencies.

The amendment being offered in the nature of a substitute to the District of Columbia appropriations bill will provide funding of \$8 million for management reforms, and these reforms are already under way. But without passage of this bill, the reform program will simply fall apart.

Mr. President, this amendment is very similar to the District of Columbia appropriations bill that has been pending before the Senate for several weeks. This amendment reflects the work of the Congress, city officials, and the financial control board to bring about a balanced District budget. This budget is balanced 1 year ahead of the schedule set by the Congress in 1995 when it created the financial control board to rescue the city from insolvency and incompetence.

To reach consensus on how to balance the budget, the control board and the elected city council first rejected several of the proposed budgets. This budget is a more conservative approach. This amendment actually cuts most city agencies, with a few exceptions, such as public safety. The focus of this bill is to balance the budget and reform the city's management problems.

It is a good bill and I urge its support by my colleagues. I want to especially thank the ranking member, Senator BARBARA BOXER, and KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON for their hard work on the Appropriations Committee. I want to thank the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, and the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, for their help and guidance in the past several months. I also wish to take a moment to thank Mary Beth Nethercutt, Jim Hyland, Dave Landers, of my staff, Jay Kimmit, and the rest of the minority staff for their help on this bill.

Mr. President, I yield the balance of my time.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members be granted full floor privileges during consideration of the District of Columbia and Omnibus Appropriations bills; James Morhard, Paddy Link, Kevin Linskey, Carl